

## **REMARKS**

The Examiner has rejected claim 7 as being anticipated by Greef, 6,032,129.

The Examiner states that Greef teaches all of the limitations of claim 7. Greef discloses a system and method of providing a virtual shopping experience for an online shopper. Greef discloses the shopper selecting a sales agent to assist in the shopping experience.

Applicant has amended claim 7 to state that the user logs into the database, enters to password or information, chooses the virtual sales agent and provides the information to the sales agent. Greef teaches that a sales representative creates customer persona based on their experiences with customers. The customer personas are provided to an electronic catalog shopper to configure customer actors to behave like customers. The shopper then in the virtual shopping experience scenario commissions a selective and particular sales agent to provide advice to the customer actor based on their specific needs and shopping personality. As stated above the amended claim 7 requires that the user perform all of the steps in claim 7. Greef teaches that the customer actor make some of these choices. Therefore claim 7 is not anticipated or obvious over Greef.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3, 6, 8, 9, 11 and 15 as being obvious over Tavor, 6,070,149 in view of Lauffer, 6,223,165.

The Examiner states that Tavor teaches a system and method of providing an online customer with the assistance of a virtual sales representative or human sales representative. Tavor further teaches providing information from a sales agent to a

computer database. The virtual sales representative interacts with online customers, asks a customer questions and receives answers, wherein the customer's responses to queries are stored. The system also stores past transactions, past responses, price and quantity. Tavor teaches logging into a computer database by the client and determines from where the client is logging in, inquires where a customer lives geographically. Tavor provides past business transactions. Tavor further provides further information, the agent asks questions to narrow decision making to motivate the customer, the information being provided by web site, email or phone. The system of Tavor receives credit and shipping information. Tavor further provides sales agent age and gender.

The Examiner states that Lauffer teaches a system and method of connecting a consumer seeking advice from an expert in an online environment, communicate using web, TV, cell phones, personal computers, using quality to distinguish potential experts, and further teaches the consumer making a purchasing decision based on quality of a potential purchasable service. The Examiner states that it would have been obvious to modify the method of Tavor to disclose quality as a purchase decision criteria as taught by Lauffer, in order to help a virtual sales rep provide additional criteria for purchase decision making by customers, and thereby attract customers to the service desiring quality products. Tavor does not teach a 3-D representative of a sales agent. Lauffer teaches 3-D graphics and teaches using online avatars to represent themselves with the option of voice and facial expression. Would be obvious to modify Tavor to implement 3-D rep of online entity as taught by Lauffer to provide visual representation, and attract customers.

Amended Claim 1 teaches a system for performing sales transactions online comprising: a database. The database contains information about various sales agents. The sales agent information comprises whether sales agent is male or female, and age of sales agent. The database contains information about each user. The information comprises information about a user's personal life, and information about a user's business activities. The database communicates with the user either orally or in writing.

Tavor relates to a system that offers the user products, services, or ideas according to the parameters collected from the user. Tavor does not teach that the database comprises information about whether a sales agent is male or female or the age of the sales agent. Instead, the section cited by the Examiner states that a sales agent may be provided to the user, based on the user's age and gender, not the sales agent's age and gender. Further, since all Tavor teaches is selling a product and questions and answers related to the product, Tavor does not teach that the database comprises information about a user's personal life and business activities. The Examiner only offers Lauffer for the 3-d representative and quality. There is no reason to combine the references. Whereas Tavor relates to selling products, Lauffer relates to selling services of experts, and that is why they teach a 3-D representative of the expert, and teach the user choosing an expert based on their expertise. Tavor does not concern this. For these reasons claim 1 is not obvious over Tavor in view of Lauffer.

Claim 2 depends on claim 1 wherein the sales agent comprises a three-dimensional representation of a person.

For the reasons stated above for claim 1, including the reasons that there is no teachings to combine the references, claim 2 is not obvious over the prior art.

Claim 3 has been cancelled.

Claim 6 depends on claim 1 wherein the communication can be via e-mail, a web site, palm pilot, cell phone, or other wireless means.

For the reasons stated above for claim 1, claim 6 is not obvious over the prior art.

Amended Claim 8 teaches a method of performing a sales transaction online comprising: providing information from a sales agent to a computer database prior to a client logging on to the database. The information comprises information about a clients personal life, past business transactions, and information about products comprising price, quality and quantity. The client logs into the computer database. The database determines where the client is logging in from. The database provides information to the client concerning the client's personal life. The database provides information to the client concerning past business transactions. The database provides information to the client comprising price, quality or quantity information for products for sale. The client provides further information to the computer database in relation to information provided to the client.

Tavor teaches that the information regarding a client is stored on the database based on questions asked by the sales agent. Therefore the information cannot be stored on the database prior to the client logging into the database. Lauffer does not teach this either. The information comprises information about a clients personal life,

past business transactions, and information about products comprising price, quality and quantity. Neither Tavor or Lauffer teach that this information is entered into the database prior to the client logging on to the database. The database determines where the client is logging in from. The section cited by the Examiner in Tavor just asks where the person lives, not where the user is logging in from, which could be where the user works, on vacation, etc. The database provides information to the client concerning the client's personal life. The database provides information to the client concerning past business transactions. The database provides information to the client comprising price, quality or quantity information for products for sale. Neither Tavor or Lauffer teach providing the above information to a client. The client provides further information to the computer database in relation to information provided to the client. Further neither Tavor or Lauffer teach that the client provides information in response to the information described above. Therefore, claim 8 is not obvious over Tavor in view of Lauffer.

Claim 9 depends on claim 8 wherein said information is provided via e-mail, a web site, palm pilot, cell phone, or other wireless means.

For the reasons stated above for claim 8, claim 9 is not obvious over the prior art.

Claim 11 depends on claim 1 wherein the user's business activities comprise types of purchases said user has made, sales range of goods or services user has made in past, delivery, shipping and billing information.

Neither Tavor or Lauffer teach that the business activities comprise the above. Further, for the reasons stated above for claim 1, claim 11 is not obvious over the prior art.

Claim 15 depends on claim 8 and further comprises providing information to the computer database in relation to information provided by the client.

For the reasons stated above for claim 8, claim 15 is not obvious over the prior art.

The Examiner has rejected claim 10 as being obvious over Tavor and Lauffer as applied to claim 3 and further in view of Official Notice. The Examiner states that Tavor and Lauffer teaches demographic information. Examiner takes position that it is old and well known to ask buyer about special interests in hobbies, sports and family interests.

Claim 10 depends on claim 1, wherein the user's personal life comprises information about the user's family, hobbies, where the user lives, and sports teams liked by the user.

Nowhere do Tavor or Lauffer discuss information about the user's personal life which includes information about the user's family, hobbies, where the user lives and sports teams liked by the user. For the reasons stated above for claim 1, claim 10 is not obvious over the prior art.

The Examiner has rejected claim 12 as being obvious over Tavor and Lauffer as applied to claim 8 and further in view of Official Notice. The prior art does not disclose

providing weather information. The Examiner states that it is old and well known that weather conditions motivate buyers to make purchasing decisions.

Claim 12 depends on claim 8 and further comprises: providing weather information to the client based on where the client has logged in from.

As stated above, neither Tavor or Lauffer determine where a user is login in from. Further the reasons for providing weather information is not to sell a product, but to converse with the client. For these reasons and the reasons stated above for claim 8, claim 12 is not obvious over the prior art.

The Examiner has rejected claims 4 and 13 as being obvious over Tavor and Lauffer as applied to claims 1 and 8 and further in view of Official Notice. The Examiner takes the position that it is old and well known for business transactions to convey shipped product received by the customer as having been received in order to accurately record the status of the purchased product for buyer-seller use.

Regarding claim 13, for the reasons stated above for claim 8, claim 13 is not obvious over the prior art.

Claim 4 depends on claim 1 wherein the database records each sales transaction completed.

For the reasons stated above for claim 1, claim 4 is not obvious over the prior art.

Applicant believes the application is now in condition for allowance.

"EXPRESS MAIL" Mailing Label No. EV 685800898 US  
Date of Deposit: October 6, 2005  
I hereby certify that this paper (and any document(s) attached herewith  
Is being deposited with the United States Postal Service "Express Mail  
Post Office to Addressee" service under 37 C.F.R. 1.10 on the  
date indicated above and is addressed to the Commissioner  
for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313 on  
October 6, 2005

Signature:

Name: Debbie Broderick

Respectfully submitted,



Philip M. Weiss  
Reg. No. 34,751  
Attorney for Applicant  
Weiss & Weiss  
300 Old Country Rd., Ste. 251  
Mineola, NY 11501  
(516) 739-1500